PAPIAS ON MARK

BY

HORACE ABRAM RIGG, Jr.
Western Reserve University

Ever since the middle of the nineteenth century, when the study of the Synoptic Gospels began strikingly to change the traditional outlook on the Gospel according to Mark [1]), a statement of PAPIAS expressly concerning the composition of Mark has been a veritable stumbling block. It has "probably been discussed more than any other passage in any early Christian writer outside the New Testament" [2]) and it has occasioned "an endless amount of controversy" [3]) and an almost tiresomely "endless discussion" [4]). This particular statement of PAPIAS would appear to be our earliest clear-cut reference to a work of one of the evangelists which discovers the very name of the author [5]). And what PAPIAS seems to say seems to go against what on nearly every other ground modern scholarship has come to conclude about Mark. Despite several generations of interpretation and argument—and counter argument—the statement, as bequeathed to us, stands in the way [6]). It is most unfortunate that the work of PAPIAS, from which this troublesome passage seems to derive, is no longer extant; though I stand with those who venture to hope we may yet come upon it [7]).

I suggest that the statement, as bequeathed to us, is incorrect. I propose, therefore, to make a slight emendation of the text which

[1]) This traditional outlook is perhaps best summed up and expressed in AUGUSTINE, *De Consensu Evangelistarum* I. 3-4: isti quatuor evangelistae . . . hoc ordine scripsisse perhibentur: primum Matthaeus, deinde Marcus . . . Marcus eum subsecutus tanquam pedissequus et breviator eius videtur . . . "that Mark was, as it were, the humble companion and abridger" of Matthew.

[2]) H. A. GUY, *The Origin of the Gospel of Mark*, New York 1955, 15.

[3]) V. H. STANTON, *The Gospels as Historical Documents* I, Cambridge 1903, 52.

[4]) Thus A. E. J. RAWLINSON, *St. Mark*, London 1925, xxv-xxviii.

[5]) Thus M. DIBELIUS in *Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart* IV, 892-3.

[6]) Unless one suspects forgery, as seems to be the case behind the arguments of A. LOISY, *Les Évangiles Synoptiques* I, Paris 1907, 243.

[7]) Thus C. R. GREGORY, *Canon and Text of the N. T.*, New York 1929, 98: "They (the five books of Papias) may still be found in some corner of the east."

thereby makes the whole passage sounder in its own context and which makes it indeed fit into and even corroborate what we have come on other grounds to conclude about Mark. With this specific undertaking in mind and because, as is often the outcome of "endless discussion", not a little has become muddled, I propose in the following paper first (A) to discover what we can relevantly and with reasonable certainty know about PAPIAS and his work in question; second (B) briefly to discuss the whole passage from which the statement is derived; third (C) to proffer the emendation and the pertinent grounds, which are primarily contextual and linguistic, for doing so; and finally (D) to discover briefly the resultant clarification which such an emendation allows in this hitherto vexing problem concerning Mark and his gospel account.

A

PAPIAS was bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia [1]). EUSEBIUS, indeed, refers to him immediately after mentioning Polycarp as bishop of Smyrna and just before mentioning Ignatius as bishop of Antioch—all three presumably flourishing about the same time [2]). Though guesses have been made otherwise, it would appear that PAPIAS was a Phrygian. Certainly he had spent crucial years there in Phrygia as bishop and rather earlier in his career EUSEBIUS connects him directly with Philip the Apostle and his daughters who lived in Hierapolis [3]). He is known to have composed a work, in five

---

[1]) EUSEBIUS, *Historia Ecclesiastica* (hereinafter quoted, for convenience, from the Loeb edition) III, xxxvi. 2 and II, xv. 2; cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V. 33.4 (all the Fathers hereafter will be quoted, except where qualified otherwise, from the Berlin and Vienna editions).

[2]) The text: καθ' ὃν ἐγνωρίζετο Παπίας, τῆς ἐν Ἱεραπόλει παροικίας καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος . . . "Well known men at the time were Papias of Hierapolis, who was indeed bishop there . . ." For the special significance of παροικέω in early Christian usage, see MOULTON-MILLIGAN, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (1949) s.v. and survivals of such usage among 17th century divines in T. MORTON, *On the Catholic Church*, London 1596, 30—quoted from H. F. WOODHOUSE. *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology* 1547-1603, New York 1954, 115, cf. 171.

[3]) H. E. III. xxxix. 9. Papias (also Pappias) is a common Phrygian name. It is found even in the epithet of the Hierapolitan Zeus Παπίᾳ Διὶ σωτῆρ (BOECKH, *C.I.G.*, 3817), cf. W. ALY, *Pauly-Wissowa* s.v. The fact that the name occurs elsewhere does not counterbalance the preponderance of the name in or near Phrygia. For others see F. MUNZER, *Pauly-Wissowa* s.v. Cf. J. B. LIGHTFOOT, *Supernatural Religion*, London 1889, 153 and esp, T. ZAHN, *Geschichte d. neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Erlangen 1909, V, 94, VI,

books, entitled *Interpretations of the Oracles of the Lord.* This work survives only in fragments of quotations from it or in occasional allusions to, or based on, it [1]). If we are to believe Irenaeus, these five books constitute all his writings, for he refers to something in the fourth book and mentions, apparently exclusively, that five books were all that he wrote [2]). They were probably written in Greek. In any case, there is no evidence that they were done directly or in translation in Latin [3]). We cannot date either PAPIAS or his work with any further authoritative accuracy. It is probable, in my opinion, that he was born about A.D. 70 and that he lived till about A.D. 150. It is probable, too, that he wrote his work near the end of his life; he himself implies that he had spent much time collecting the data for it [4]).

About PAPIAS himself opinion seems to have varied, though on what evidence beyond hearsay it is practically impossible to ascertain now. EUSEBIUS, from whom we know most about PAPIAS, though it is tantalizingly fragmentary at best, dubbed him as a man "of very little intelligence, as is clear from his books" [5]). Others

---

109 and W. H. P. HATCH, "Über d. Name P.", *ZNTW* XII, 1911, 83. For Phrygia, in general, in early Christian history, see W. M. RAMSAY, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia,* Oxford 1895-7; cf. E. PREUSCHEN-G. KRÜGER, "Das Altertum", *Handbuch d. Kirchengeschichte* I, Tübingen 1923, 45 ff.

[1]) H. E. III. xxxix. 1: τοῦ δὲ Παπία συγγράμματα πέντε τὸν ἀριθμὸν φέρεται, ἃ καὶ ἐπιγέγραπται Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως. An endless and probably futile discussion has arisen over whether "sayings" is preferable to "oracles" in the title. The Latin of RUFINUS gives: Verborum dominicorum explanatio. The exact title is irrelevant to this paper. For Λογία, see G. KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch z. N. T.* s.v.

[2]) EUSEBIUS, *loc. cit.* (IRENAEUS, *Adv. Haer.* V, 33. 4).

[3]) For confusions between a medieval lexicographer-grammarian and Bishop Papias, as with G. BICKEL, *Zeitschrift f. katholische Theologie III,* Innsbruck 1879, 799 ff. and first, to my knowledge, refuted by J. B. LIGHTFOOT, *op. cit.,* 210 ff., see O. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte d. altkirchlichen Litteratur* I, Freiburg i. Breisgau 1913, 450. Cf. E. GOODSPEED, *A History of Early Christian Literature,* Chicago 1942, 161-4.

[4]) See F. WOTKE, *Pauly-Wissowa,* s.v., where the pertinent literature is cited. J. CHAPMAN, *Catholic Encyclopedia* s.v. suggests "the work of Papias was evidently written in his old age" but J. V. BARTLET would make the work not long after A.D. 110, in "Papias' 'Exposition' " *Amicitiae Corolla* ed. H. G. WOOD, London 1933, 15 ff. The available data warrant only guesses within the terminal dates I have suggested. The key passage is H. E. III. xxxix. Cf. J. SCHMID, *Lexikon f. Theologie u. Kirche,* Freiburg i. Breisgau 1935, 926 ff.

[5]) H. E. III. xxxix. 13: σφόδρα γάρ τοι σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν . . . We have, of course, only what EUSEBIUS quotes of the five books of PAPIAS. R. J.

however, refer to him as "the great" or "the illustrious" [1]). His importance appears, at one time, to have been such that Jerome felt called upon to deny reports that he had translated the work of PAPIAS along with that of Polycarp [2]). It is also to be noted that, according to some medieval manuscripts, PAPIAS was the amanuensis of John the Evangelist [3]).

Concerning his work Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις [4]) we can guess only that PAPIAS seems to have defended some of the millenial beliefs current in his time and possibly particularly so in Phrygia [5]). It is possible that these beliefs were at the bottom of the belittling attitude of EUSEBIUS. This attitude, by the way, EUSEBIUS does not confine to PAPIAS, though he strongly implies that PAPIAS was responsible for the chiliastic waywardness of the others who relied on the authority of his antiquity [6]). The whole problem of the millenial beliefs at this time is beyond the province of this paper—in any case, how much these beliefs of PAPIAS rightly or wrongly influenced his five books we are now in no position to know [7]). The surviving fragments of PAPIAS have often been

---

DEFERRARI, "Church History", *The Fathers of the Church*, ed. L. SCHOPP, New York 1953, 205 n. 13, thinks these fragments bear out this stricture; but cf. on at least one point, B. W. BACON, "Adhuc in corpore constituto", *Harvard Theological Review* 23, Cambridge 1930, 305-7 and B. H. BRANSCOMB, "Mark", *Moffatt N. T. Commentary*, New York-London 1938, Introduction. H. J. LAWLOR, "Eusebius on Papias", *Hermathena* 43, 1922 is unavailable to me.

[1]) Thus Anastasius of Sinai: ὁ πάνυ in M. J. ROUTH, *Reliquiae Sacrae* I, Oxford 1846, 15; cf. MIGNE, *P. G.* LXXXIX 860c "clarissimus" — ex Papia viro clarissimo Hierapolitano. Also, καὶ Παπίας ὁ πολὺς et celebris Papias Hierapolitanus (MIGNE, *P. G.* LXXXIX 961d; cf. ROUTH, *op. cit.*, 16 "celebrio").

[2]) Ep. ad Lucinium (ed. VILLARSI, 71). For other citations, see F. WOTKE, *Pauly-Wissowa*, s.v., esp. 971-4.

[3]) Codex Regina 14 (Vatican) and in Codex Toletanus, at the conclusion of the prologue, printed in WORDSWORTH-WHITE, *N. T. Latinum* I. 490. There may be some valid tradition behind this prologue? It agrees closely with JEROME, *De Viris Illustribus*, ix. It would, of course, be of extraordinary interest if PAPIAS had been the amanuensis of John. I know of nothing that either proves or disproves this tradition.

[4]) One can call the title "Explanation of the Sayings of the Lord"—thus J. QUASTEN, Patrology I, Westminster, Maryland 1950, 82.

[5]) H. E. III. xxxix. 11-2.

[6]) *Loc. cit.* I am inclined to suspect there was more than chiliasm at the bottom of the criticism of EUSEBIUS.

[7]) In one instance, at least, if we can believe IRENAEUS, *Adv. Haer.* V, 33, it would appear that PAPIAS confused expressions of Jesus with verses from the Apocalypse of Baruch. Cf. F. LOOFS, ". . . Quellen bei Irenaeus",

collected [1]). A perusal of these fragments, so often taken blindly or without full regard to their context, suggests that the work was "most likely very unequal" [2]) but that PAPIAS was, nevertheless, "much attached to the Church and to tradition" [3]).

Though these fragments of the work of PAPIAS do not allow us anything substantial about the original contents, we do know something of what PAPIAS intended to accomplish and how, in general, he went about it. PAPIAS himself, as quoted by EUSEBIUS, tells us expressly, though briefly, about his intentions and the manner in which he went about realizing them. It would appear that he wanted to focus light on the gospel history and he particularly sought to do just this by tapping the oral traditions of those who had known, in the flesh, original members of the apostolic circle. It is to be noted that PAPIAS lived at a critical time for accomplishing this; namely, conversing with such persons. It is this fact that makes whatever he adds of such potential importance. There survive some of the very words of the preface to his work, as quoted by EUSEBIUS as follows:

"And I shall not scruple to add (for thee?) to the interpretations all that I ever learned well from the presbyters and kept well in my

Texte u. Untersuchungen, ed. GEBHARDT-HARNACK-SCHMIDT 46, Leipzig 1930, 328-38. For chiliasm in the early church—a field that needs reworking —suffice it with H. LECLERCQ, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* xi, s.v. Millénarisme and L. GUY, *Le Millénarisme dans ses origines et son développement*, Paris 1904. F. ACANIZ, *Ecclesia patrist. et millenarismus*, Granada 1934, is unavailable to me.

[1]) The first critical attempt known to me was M. J. ROUTH, *Reliquiae Sacrae*. The latest would seem to be M. BUCELLATO, "Papias de Hierapoli", *Studi Biblici* III, Milan 1936. Text and translation in E. PREUSCHEN, *Antilegomena*, Giessen 1905, 91 ff., 154 ff.; cf. K. BIHLMEYER, *Die apostolischen Väter* I, Tübingen 1924, 133-40 and B. ALTANER, *Patrologie*, Freiburg 1950, 83-4 and J. QUASTEN (cited above, n. 4 on p. 164). Another readily available compilation is F. X. FUNK, "Die apostolischen Väter", *Sammlung ausgewählter kirch. u. dogmengesch. Quellenschriften* 2 Rhe, 1. hft., Tübingen-Leipzig 1901, 126-34. Cf. A. HARNACK, *Geschichte d. altchristlichen Litteratur* I, Leipzig 1893, 65-9.

[2]) H. M. GWATKIN, *Early Church History* II, London 1909, 102-4. Some of his accounts were just mythical, according to EUSEBIUS, H. E. III. xxxix. 12: καί τινα ἄλλα μυθικώτερα.. Tapping these parts of PAPIAS was a practice indulged in long after, and in spite of, EUSEBIUS. Thus (to be added to the common listings of authors using PAPIAS) the *World History* of Agapius (Maḥbūb ibn Qusṭanṭīn), for which, see G. GRAF, "Geschichte d. Christlichen Arabischen Literatur" II, *Studi e Testi* 133, Città del Vaticano 1947, 39-41.

[3]) J. LEBRETON in J. LEBRETON & J. ZEILLER, *A History of the Primitive Church*, New York 1949, 686.

memory, being confident of their truth. For, quite unlike most (nowadays), I did not rejoice in them who say much or in them who relate the commandments of others (*ad sensum*: anybody and everybody) but rather in them who teach the truth and recount those from the Lord to the faith derived from truth itself. So, if anyone ever came who had been a follower of the presbyters, I inquired about the words of the presbyters—what Andrew or Peter or Thomas or James or John or Matthew or any other disciple of the Lord had said and what Aristion and the presbyter John, the Lord's disciples, were saying. For I did not think that I could get so much from books as from the very words of the living and surviving voice" [1]).

Clearly EUSEBIUS knew of other sayings of PAPIAS which had "apparently reached him by tradition" or "as though they came to him from some unwritten tradition" [2]). It would appear, therefore, that PAPIAS had long gone about—at least in western Asia Minor—talking with anyone who had personally known the original circle of disciples and apostles and plying them with questions about what the original disciples and apostles had done or said. As with so many who undertake this kind of research, PAPIAS relied on his memory after the event (he himself asserts this much). We are unfortunately, now, in no position to appraise the quality, particularly the accuracy, of his memory work. All we know is the fact that PAPIAS seems to have thought well of it and that EUSEBIUS is silent about it. Lately, however, it is sometimes forgotten that there is no evidence to allow the assumption that PAPIAS relied solely on these extra traditions he had picked up or that he was ignorant of or ignored the basic gospel accounts which were probably already substantially formed by his time.

So much for PAPIAS and his work, for the time being.

[1]) Frankly, the Greek of this quoted preface is sticky for translation purposes. Presumably these are the very words of the preface. We can wish that more of the context had been given, though attempts to conjure up that context are dangerous; cf. T. ZAHN, *Introduction to the N. T.* II, New York 1917, 438 ff. I take it that PAPIAS has just been talking, in his preface, about the "Interpretations" (N.B. apparently the main subject of his treatise) and feels called upon to explain—almost apologetically—why he deigned to add to or insert in them his own collected traditions. The grammar allows us, but does not force us, to infer that all but Aristion and the presbyter John are dead. On this problem, cf. F. WOTKE, *Pauly-Wissowa*, s.v. See, too, A. SCHLATTER, *The Church in the N. T. Period*, London 1955, 315.

[2]) H. E. III. xxxix. 8, 11.

B

Among the odds and ends fragments that survive of the work of PAPIAS are two that specifically mention and add to our knowledge of the gospels according to Matthew and to Mark. The former does not here concern us. About Mark he says the following [1]).

"καὶ τοῦθ' ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἔλεγεν· Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος, ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν, ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν, οὐ μέντοι τάξει, τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα, οὔτε γὰρ ἤκουσεν τοῦ κυρίου οὔτε παρηκολούθησεν αὐτῷ, ὕστερον δέ, ὡς ἔφην, Πέτρῳ· ὃς πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων, ὥστε οὐδὲν ἥμαρτεν Μάρκος οὕτως ἔνια γράψας ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευσεν, ἑνὸς γὰρ ἐποιήσατο πρόνοιαν, τοῦ μηδὲν ὧν ἤκουσεν παραλιπεῖν ἢ ψεύσασθαι τι ἐν αὐτοῖς" ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.

"And the Presbyter said (used to say) this: 'Mark became an interpreter of Peter and wrote accurately all that he remembered, not indeed in order, of the things said or done by the Lord. For he had not heard the Lord, nor had he followed him, but later, as I have said, followed Peter, who (as was his wont) taught but did not make, as it were, any special arrangement of the Lord's sayings (he taught as the occasion demanded), and thus Mark, in writing down a saying as he remembered it, did not go wrong. For he took every precaution not to omit anything of what he had heard nor did he set down any false statement therein' " [2]).

In general, this translation stands with the many others that have been made. I veer from the norm, however, on the interpretation of σύνταξις. Almost certainly this cannot be a reference to *orderly arrangement*, as such—whatever in context that can mean. First, because there is no convincing evidence whatsoever that

[1]) H. E. III. xxxix. 14, introduces this direct quotation from PAPIAS with these words: ἀναγκαίως νῦν . . . περὶ Μάρκου τοῦ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον γεγραφότος ἐκτέθεντα διὰ τούτων. "We are now constrained to add to the words already quoted from him a tradition about Mark who wrote the gospel which he sets forth as follows."

[2]) EUSEBIUS concludes this direct quotation: ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἱστόρηται τῷ Παπίᾳ περὶ τοῦ Μάρκου.

anybody was giving or had given an orderly arrangement during this very period with which Mark's order could be unfavourably compared. Whatever we can guess about the teachings of this period—or, for that matter, the writings, if there were any—discovers that they were occasional. Second, because Peter, along with the other apostles and other early prominent Christians, were very much on the go. And if, as seems to me likely, the crucial association of Mark with Peter was in Rome, the duration of that period must be looked upon as a short one [1]). Third, because Peter must have been too busy and because he probably was not qualified to give what would amount to an orderly course of university lectures.

I am, therefore, inclined to think the reference is to Peter's lack of style and grammatical nicety. EUSEBIUS himself states that the apostles "were simple men in speech" and that "they had neither the knowledge nor the desire to render the teachings of the master in persuasive or artistic language" and that "they gave practically no attention at all to their style" [2]). Of all those that had been with the Lord, only Matthew and John have left us their recollections and "tradition says that they took to writing perforce" [3]). It is, perhaps, curiously fitting that PAPIAS, who scorned book-learning as against the living voice, should have stressed such a point and it is equally interesting that Chrysostom, commenting on Mark's dependence on Peter, allows that Peter was "a man of few words" [4]).

---

[1]) It "possibly did not cover an entire year" (T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II. 433, cf. 395). For the Roman background in general, see G. LAPIANA, "Foreign Groups in Rome", *Harvard Theological Review* 20, 1927. But see below for Mark's pre-Roman association with Peter.

[2]) H. E. III. xxxix. 3-4: . . . τὴν δὲ γλῶτταν ἰδιωτεύοντες, κτλ.

[3]) EUSEBIUS, *loc. cit.* The sense of the words could also, I think, mean that only they (Matthew and John) wrote finally because only they had it in their power to do so — οὓς καὶ ἐπάναγκες ἐπὶ τὴν γραφὴν ἐλθεῖν κατέχει λόγος. It is important to keep in mind that the work of the apostles was preaching and teaching, not making written records. Cf. T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II. 367 ff. and B. S. EASTON, "The First Evangelic Tradition", *JBL* 50, 1931, 148-55—also F. V. FILSON, "The Christian Teacher in the First Century", *JBL* 60, 1941. CLEMENT, ap. Eus. H. E. II. xv. 2: . . . ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης . . . clearly implies written composition.

[4]) *In Matthaeum Hom.* IV. 46 (ed. F. FIELD, [Cambridge, 1889], I. 39). Aside from the statements of EUSEBIUS, we have the notice of Epiphanius, *Haer.* LI. 12, that, after a lifetime of preaching, John in old age resorted to the written word — διὸ ὕστερον ἀναγκάζει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τὸν Ἰωάννης . . .

Whether, of course, Peter actually needed an interpreter, in the sense of dragoman, is yet another question. The words in question (Μάρκος μὲν ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος) do not immediately warrant more than guesses and the guesses become, sometimes, acutely troublesome when they concern the language or languages which Peter could or could not use with reasonable facility [1]).

C

We come now to the crucial and stumbling block passage in particular. Mark, as we have seen, became Peter's interpreter and wrote accurately all that he had remembered of the things, mentioned by Peter, that the Lord had said and done οὐ μέντοι τάξει "not, indeed, in order"! We have no clear idea what went immediately before this passage that EUSEBIUS quotes. It must stand, as of now, quite on its own [2]). This curious and troublesome statement, almost parenthetically in passing set into the passage as a whole, calls forth no comment from PAPIAS, as quoted by EUSEBIUS, nor does EUSEBIUS himself comment upon it, nor does anybody else comment meaningfully upon it till the nineteenth century [3]). In those early centuries when, certainly in some parts of the

[1]) Sternly stated guesses crop up here and there. J. B. LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers* I. 2, London-New York 1890, 494, for example, held that "the reference must be to the Latin, not to the Greek language". Others, at random, L. E. ELLIOTT-BINNS, *The Beginnings of Western Christendom*, London 1948, 92 suggests that Peter "had to use Mark as an interpreter"—cf. P. G. S. HOPWOOD, *The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church*, New York 1937, 147. Ἑρμηνευτής appears to be rare; see LIDDELL & SCOTT and MOULTON-MILLIGAN, s.v. It should not, here, be interpreted too literally because in the only other place, to my knowledge, where EUSEBIUS says: "Marcus evangelista, Petri interpretes" (*Chron.* ad anno Abrah. 2057) Mark is not with Peter at all but in Egypt—where, by the way, JEROME, *De Vir. Ill.* xxxvi, thought the Alexandrian School had been founded by Mark. Cf. H. E. II. xvi. 1. LEBRETON in LEBRETON-ZEILLER, *op. cit.* I, 101: "St. Mark, the interpreter of the memoirs of Peter" and ZEILLER, *op. cit.*, 315: "the disciple of Peter" (from EUSEBIUS, H. E. V. viii. 3). Cf. T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 454-6.

[2]) Attempts, such as T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 438 ff., notwithstanding.

[3]) Except those who simply quote PAPIAS probably solely on the basis of excerpts from EUSEBIUS (as appears to have been the case, for example, with Maḥbūb ibn Quṣṭanṭīn). Thus Victorinus of Pettau (for which see B. ALTANER, *Patrologie*, 151-2): Marcus interpretes Petri ea quae in munere docebat commemoratus conscripsit, sed non ordine. Cf. the Latin of Rufinus: non tamen per ordinem ea. Cf. N. J. HOMMES, *Het Testimoniaboek*, Amsterdam 1935, 225 ff. They seem to rattle off this curious remark as though it were meaningless or, in any case, harmless?!

church, Mark was not favourably looked upon, surely such a criticism would have been taken up by some commentators. Yet it is never mentioned, except in blind quotations, so far as I can make out. What is more, it runs counter to practically all modern research on the synoptic Gospels, in which only by clever and often learned squirming—because of these three words—can any lack of order be reasonably detected in Mark's account. For, unless one is determined to discover a lack of order, one thing seems to stand out. Namely, that Mark's account of the Gospel has order. In my opinion, it discovers a magnificently orderly account. What account discovers more order? [1]) Bear in mind too, that Mark in many ways is opening up a new field or form of literature [2]). It is, indeed, curious, it seems to me, that nobody—even after the lead given by PAPIAS —felt called upon to discover Mark's lack of order till the late nineteenth century.

Comments about Mark's lack of order, therefore, do not seem to me to make much sense, painstakingly ingenious though they often are, unless one wants to conjure up some other Mark than the one we in fact have [3]). The most intense of modern critical study

[1]) This would seem to be the consensus of scholarly opinion since the rise of the study of the Synoptic Gospels; though, depending on how bothersome these words of PAPIAS seem, the order in Mark is discovered with varying degrees of timidity. See KIRSOPP LAKE, *Introduction to the N. T.*, New York 1936, 23-4, 275-7 but cf. the valiant attempts to discover lack of order in L. GUY, *op. cit.* Thus, merely to cite a few, C. VON WEIZÄCKER, *The Apostolic Age* II, London 1895, 39 ff. and esp. 68, concluded that Mark's arrangement is the best. E. A. ABBOTT, *The Fourfold Gospel*, Cambridge, 1913, 82 ff. assumed that "not in order" refers to Mark's starting point. Cf. T. HENSHAW, *N. T. Literature*, London 1952), 92 ff., 107, 149 and F. HAUCK, *Das Evangelium Markus*, Leipzig 1931, 2. See, also, now, P. PARKER, *The Gospel before Mark*, Chicago 1953, 149 ff. C. C. TORREY, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, New York-London, seems to doubt the Peter-Mark traditions in part; cf. R. H. LIGHTFOOT, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, Oxford 1950, 1-14. For older studies, still valuable is A. HILGENFELD, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie* XXIX, Leipzig 1886, 257-91 and P. WENDLAND, "Die urchristlichen Literaturformen", *Handb. z. N. T.* I. 3, Tübingen 1912, 260 ff. See M. GOGUEL, *Jesus*, New York 1944, 142, for "traces of an orderly plan"; cf. C. GUIGNEBERT, *Jesus*, New York 1935, 39 ff. and C. G. MONTIFIORE, *The Synoptic Gospels*, London 1927, xxxii ff.

[2]) So, J. WEISS, *Das älteste Evangelium*, Berlin 1903, 5 ff. Cf. W. VON CHRIST, "Geschichte d. griechischen Litt." *Hdbh. d. Altertumswissenschaft* VII. 2. 2, Munchen 1924, 1198-9. For Mark's *biographical* gospel, see F. C. BURKITT, *Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, London 1922, 128.

[3]) To be sure, F. H. COLSON, *Journ. Theol. Studies* XIV 62 ff., sensed a

devoted to the Synoptic Gospels in general and to Mark's gospel in particular is against such a criticism as these three words imply. In this light, the more I study this passage as a whole and οὐ μέντοι τάξει in particular, the more I am convinced that it is not a reference to the manner in which Mark wrote his gospel account but, rather, is it a reference to the manner in which Mark served as "interpreter" to Peter [1]). Is it not possible, therefore, that PAPIAS—gathering these extra bits of information orally, as he confesses he did—heard or garbled the remembrance of a quite different word depending on but one crucial letter which in oral communication could easily, probably, have been confused and interchanged? That word, I suggest, was τάχυς. Thus, the statement in question should have been οὐ μέντοι τάχει and the whole statement could then be understood somewhat as follows.

"Mark became Peter's interpreter and as much as he (Peter) remembered of the things said and done by the Lord, he (Mark) set down in writing accurately, indeed not at all hastily—in a slipshod manner (i. e. not at all carelessly and ill-thought out, so to speak)" [2]).

Linguistically, the sound Ξ is very similar, from time to time, to that of χ and indeed almost certainly they were often confused orally [3]). It could probably be more easily confused in Phrygia

---

rhetorical, rather than chronological, τάξις was involved but this does not seem to me to be a convincing compromise. The evidence of the papyri tends to show that τάξις more and more stayed with the meaning of "order" and "listing". Cf. F. PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch d. Griech. Papyrusurkunden* II, Berlin 1927, s.v. So EUSEBIUS uses it himself—H. E. VII. xv. 2.

[1]) I confess to being well and painfully aware of the weaknesses of my position but with such an impasse boldness, though a nervous boldness, may not be amiss.

[2]) Thus, for example: ἐν ταχύ (= ἐν τάχει) in PREISIGKE, *Sammelbuch griech. Urkunden aus Ägypten*, Berlin 1915-22, 365. For other papyrological uses, see PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. τάχυς (τάχος). The background meaning is "quickly", sometimes "in haste", though admittedly its etymology is not clear. See E. BOISACQ, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Grecque*, Heidelberg-Paris 1916, 946 s.v. τάχυς; cf. MOULTON-MILLIGAN, 626-7. N.B. that the adj. ταχύς is often construed with verbs, where the adverb would be expected; thus τάχα. See LIDDELL & SCOTT, s.v. Cf. ταχεῖ σὺν χρόνῳ in SOPHOCLES, *Oedipus Coloneus* (ed. A. C. PEARSON) 1602. The sense of my translation contains a rejection of any notion that Mark had done his work hastily—in the special sense of carelessly or inaccurately.

[3]) Thus, F. W. BLASS, *The Pronunciation of Ancient Greek*, Cambridge 1890, 114-5. These two Ξ and χ, were close enough, it would seem, as to be rarely combined with each other: thus E. H. STURTEVANT, *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*, Philadelphia 1940, 59 and 76 ff. for the aspiration

but the confusion both as to pronunciation and, what is more important, as to hearing (which is quite another thing) could have been general. Historically the sounds seem to have fluctuated enough to warrant the assumption that PAPIAS could have misheard the sound intended or that whoever was taking down what PAPIAS was saying could have misheard him [1]). In this sense, there are three possible stages in the problem. What the presbyter may have said and what PAPIAS may have heard; what PAPIAS may have remembered—though it is not impossible that for the writing of five books he may also have relied on rough notes; and what PAPIAS may have said "in old age" to an amanuensis and what the amanuensis may have heard—though it is not impossible, of course, that PAPIAS actually wrote out his work himself. Though the possibility of misreading his own notes is not to be ruled out, I am inclined to think the mistake is an oral one in origin. It could, too, have been the result of deliberate tampering [2]).

The problem is, as I see it, not linguistic in the usual sense. It is, rather, that of persons. We are dealing with a man, PAPIAS, of whose intelligence EUSEBIUS speaks disparagingly, who apparently has devoted himself to going about talking with anyone who can give him extra information orally on the gospel story and who, near the end of his life, composed in five books based on this

---

of X, and for Ξ. 90 ff. Especially interesting is the statement of Syrianus, *in Metaph.* 191. 29, here quoted. In origin, it is interesting to note that "east Greek" alphabet forms allowed Ξ = ks and also Ξ = χσ and in the "west Greek" alphabet χ = ks. See, especially, E. SCHWYZER, "Griechische Grammatik", *Hdbh. d. Altertumswissenschaft* II. 1. 1, München 1934, 144-5 and for the KOINE pronunciation problems in Egypt and Asia, 204 ff. and 211, with full literature. Bearing in mind that "il faut tenir compte aussi de ce que la κοινή est, pour une large part, du grec parlé par des étrangers . . . . qui tend a perdre ses nuances délicates . . ." (A. MEILLET, *Aperçu . . . de la Langue Grecque* [Paris, 1930] 301) it is not unlikely that these sounds were confused. Cf. MEILLET, *op. cit.*, 257 ff. and esp. 292-4.

[1]) Even the orthographical history of Ξ is interesting, particularly in cursive writing. See E. M. THOMPSON, *Greek and Latin Paleography*, Oxford 1912, 189 ff. There was, apparently, an increasing carelessness in cursive writing in the second century; cf. F. G. KENYON, *The Paleography of Greek Papyri*, Oxford 1899, 62, 66, 73-4, 86, 89. This could allow, I venture to suggest, the possibility that PAPIAS—or his secretary—could have misread rough notes.

[2]) I am strongly inclined to disregard the possibility, though, that EUSEBIUS misquoted. The more we can check him, the more we must be impressed by the essential accuracy of his quotations. Cf. B. H. STREETER, *The Four Gospels*, London 1936, 17.

material so collected a work entitled *Explanations of the Sayings of the Lord* [1]). Presumably he felt called upon to defend his usage of such material in the very preface to his work. The title itself allows the inference that the work was a miscellany of "interpretations and explanations" containing everything, probably, from the interesting and the worthwhile to just gossip and hearsay. Note, however, that these statements of PAPIAS concerning Matthew and Mark do not fall within the planned intent of the work as discovered by the title and it may not, therefore, be accidental that Eusebius quotes so little else from the work of PAPIAS. In the case in question, he is remembering what the presbyter John himself presumably told him. Now, if this John is the John of the Gospel, he could not have lived, at the very most, more than a few years into the second century [2]). We cannot now date the work of PAPIAS except to say that the probable early limit is, perhaps, A.D. 125-30 and that the certain latest limit is about A.D. 160. This means that PAPIAS must have been a very young man when he heard the words of John as a very old man and that, therefore, many years have elapsed after his hearing John before he set them down in their final written form [3]). The leaders, even including bishops, in these early years of the church are not yet the highly educated later Fathers and strictures of EUSEBIUS about the Apostles "of simple speech" apply still to many in the second century [4]). This PAPIAS—

[1]) In some ways, I think, there is hidden disparagement in the reference to "someone called Papias" (H. E. II. xv. 2): καὶ ὁ Ἱεραπολίτης ἐπίσκοπος ὀνόματι Παπιας. But we must keep well in mind that the disparagement is directed to PAPIAS himself and not to what he here quotes, from the presbyter John, about Mark.

[2]) It is just possible, as I see it. I am less critical about longevity now that I have attended (1955) the one hundredth birthday party of an old and dear acquaintance! It should be pointed out that EUSEBIUS, H. E. III.. xxxix. 5-6, is aware that the identity of the John in question is disputed. He quotes Dionysius of Alexandria at VII. xxv. 16—for whom see, now J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* II, 1953, 101-09.

[3]) We are, in other words, dealing with an old—probably a very old—man probably not highly educated, setting out to write his treatise containing or based upon what he had picked up orally over the course of many years. On this dating problem, however, see V. BARTLET in HASTINGS, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, s.v. PAPIAS, esp. 311. The point about οἱ πρεσβύτεροι must be seen in the light, now, of newer finds. Cf. A. DEISSMANN, *Licht vom Osten*, Tübingen 1923, index, esp. 315 and MOULTON-MILLIGAN, s.v.

[4]) On this general point and the educational background and interests of the Fathers see now particularly R. R. BOLGAR, *The Classical Heritage and its Beneficiaries*, Cambridge 1954, 45 ff. I am reminded of Cardinal NEWMAN, *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, ed. W. WARD, Oxford 1913, 356-7: "It

might we not expect this?—tells of marvels that had apparently reached him by the extra-traditions he had picked up and he had adduced "other accounts, as though they came to him from some unwritten tradition, and some strange parables and teachings of the Saviour and other mythical accounts" [1]).

Regardless of whether EUSEBIUS makes a fair presentation of PAPIAS in general, the whole direct quotation concerning Mark is, with my suggested emendation, more consistent with itself. PAPIAS stresses, as we might expect from what he stresses about his own activities and talents, the fact that Mark "remembered" what he had picked up from Peter. Twice, indeed, he directly states something about this *remembered* aspect of Mark's account and also twice he feels called upon to defend or explain not his lack of order but the accuracy of his memory work [2]). Clearly it is Peter who did not orally give his teachings in any finished form order (he taught as seemed fitting for this occasion and that occasion) and therefore PAPIAS stresses that Mark, nonetheless, stayed close to what he had heard, without twisting or adding anything falsely. But, on the other hand, Mark had not from the beginning thought of composing, nor had he thought of being called upon to compose, a gospel account. He had not even been a member of the original circle. He had not, therefore, kept a running day by day account from notes taken down hastily and carelessly on the spot [3]).

---

is said, and truly, that the Church of Rome possessed no great mind in the whole period of the persecution. Afterwards, for a long while, it has not a single doctor to show . . .".

[1]) H. E. III. xxxix. 8, 10-1. He adds (12): ἃ καὶ ἡγοῦμαι τὰς ἀποστολικὰς παρεκδεξάμεν διηγήσεις ὑπολαβεῖν, τὰ ἐν ὑποδείνμασι, πρὸς αὐτῶν μυστικῶς εἰρημένα μὴ συνεορακότα and he finishes him off with καὶ ταῦτα δ' ἡμῖν ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τοῖς ἐκτεθεῖσιν ἐπιτετηρήσθω.

[2]) CLEMENT, ap. EUS. H. E. VI. xiv. 5, uses τάξις clearly in a way inapplicable for our understanding of Mark when the states: αὖθις δ' ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὁ κλήμης βιβλίοις περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων παράδοσιν τῶν ἀνέκαθεν πρεσβυτέρων τέθειται . . . "with regard to the order of the gospel . . ."

[3]) At least not till the final days in Rome, according to CLEMENT, ap. EUS. H. E. VI. xiv. 6-7 (given in indirect discourse). For when Peter had preached and proclaimed the word and gospel, then those present, πολλοὺς ὄντας, παρακαλέσαι τὸν Μάρκον, ὡς ἂν ἀκολουθήσαντα αὐτῷ πόρρωθεν καὶ μεμνημένον τῶν λεχθέντων, ἀναγράψαι τὰ εἰρημένα . . . and in the Latin translation (Adumbr. in Pet. V. 13). Cf. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.* IV. 5: Licet et Marcus quod edidit Petri affirmetur, cuius interpres Marcus". I am attracted by the arguments of B. H. STREETER, *op. cit.*, 495-9, to the effect that in Rome the Christians first became "interested in history" demanding "at least a record of the Founder's life".

Rather, on the basis of his memory over a long, though occasionally broken, association with Peter, culminating in that very last period of intimate association with Peter in Rome, he had written his account with great care and accuracy. Mark did not, in other words, take down the sermons which Peter preached. Rather, because he had long been associated with Peter [1]), he became the obvious one, on the basis of what Peter had said from time to time, which he could best remember, to be charged with putting it all in writing [2]). It must be pointed out that there is no evidence to warrant our assuming that Mark relied solely on Peter [3]). But what other sources were behind Mark's account and whether Mark himself was an eye witness of some of the things he relates is quite another problem which is outside the province of this paper.

---

[1]) An interesting indication of this association is, surely, I Pet. V. 13: Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου; cf. H. E. VI. xxv. 5-6. Similar usages for others, too, in I Tim. I. 2; Philemon 10; Titus I. 4; I Cor. IV. 17. For a possible distinction between "spiritual" and "affectionate" in these usages, see H. B. SWETE, *St. Mark*, London 1909, xx-xxi. The phrase, according to C. H. TURNER, "Mark", *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, ed. C. GORE, H. L. GOUDGE, A. GUILLAUME, New York 1929, III. 43, implies "a disparity of not less than fifteen or twenty years in age and a special bond of long and affectionate relationship".

[2]) See particularly, T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 434-5. Mark, it is well known, had been around—as we might nowadays say. Paul eloquently bears witness to this at II Tim. IV. 11. On this whole question see the still important work of A. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, Göttingen 1867, 326-36.

[3]) ORIGEN, *ap. Eus.* VI, xxv, 5, need not, as it is often translated, mean that Mark was written "according to Peter's instructions" (ambiguous as this statement is in English). The text — δεύτερον δὲ τὸ Μάρκον, ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ποιήσαντα — can also simply bear witness to Mark's direct connexions with Peter, in the sense of "on the basis of Peter's instructions" because Mark was at the very feet of Peter, so to speak. See PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. ὑφηγέομαι.. Cf. P. PARKER, *op. cit.* 151 and H. A. GUY, *op. cit.* 15 ff. We know at least from the Muratorian Canon, as commonly filled in, that Mark knew of other sources. Thus, *ab init.* [Marcus . . . ? ali]quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit. For the text and literature, see E. PREUSCHEN, "Analecta", *Sammlung ausgewählter kirch.-dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften* 8, Freiburg-Leipzig 1893; cf. A. HARNACK, *Geschichte d. altchristl. Litteratur* II, 1, Leipzig 1897, 356 ff. and II. 2. 330 and A. E. J. RAWLINSON, *op. cit.* xxvii. Of Pauline evidences, which on some grounds might be expected (thus K. LAKE, *op. cit.*, 24), there would seem to be none that is convincing. Cf. M. WERNER, *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium*, Giessen 1923. In general, see P. FIEBIG, *Erzählungstil d. Evangelien*, Leipzig 1925, and the summaries of C. H. TURNER, *op. cit.*, 42 ff.

D

It is clear, it would seem, that by the end of the second century at the latest Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were commonly looked upon as the very authors of books which as early as the middle of the second century were commonly called Gospels [1]). With regard to Mark, now, the statements of PAPIAS discover at least two things which, since their acknowledged source is John, whom at least Irenaeus held to be the Apostle himself, may be considered as facts. One, that by the end of the first century, at the very latest, there was a book dealing with the words and deeds of Jesus. And this book was known at least in Asia Minor. And it was well enough known to be the subject of comment and, probably, study [2]). Two, that this book (εὐαγγέλιον) was expressly known and indubitably understood by some people to be the work of Mark, who was a disciple, in the richest sense of the word, of Peter the Apostle [3]).

As I see it, PAPIAS is therefore writing his Λογίων κυριακῶν

---

[1]) Thus, in addition to IGNATIUS, *Smyrna* VIII. 2 (cf. IRENAEUS, *Adv. Haer.* III. ii. 8-9: ... τέσσαρα καθολικὰ πνεύματα ...), JUSTIN MARTYR, *Apol.* I. 66: ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια. Cf. J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* I, 196 ff. It is possible that the singular τὸ εὐαγγέλιον was used first to cover all such writings and later, though still very early, came to be used as special designation for the individual accounts. See, in general, R. H. LIGHTFOOT, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, New York 1935.

[2]) The Gospel according to John, originating in this same area towards the end of this very period, shows, probably, acquaintance withth is very book. Though doubts have been expressed, they are not, to me convincing. See especially, J. H. BERNARD, "St. John", *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, New York 1929 xcviff. and now especially C. K. BARRETT, *Gospel ... St. John*, London 1955. And, if Irenaeus III. ii. 7 refers to Mark, then a sect (docetic) in the school of Cerinthus gave Mark a favoured position. The text: qui autem Iesum separunt a Christo et impassibilem perseverasse Christum ... id quod secundum Marcum est praeferentes evangelium, cum amore veritatis legentes illud, corrigi possunt. For possible doubts about this passage, see SWETE, *op. cit.* xxxi, where also other heretical sects interested in Mark are listed. IRENAEUS summarizes the teachings of Basilides, mentioned by SWETE, *loc. cit.* in I. xxiv. 3-4. For the texts of BASILIDES, see W. VÖLKER, *Quellen z. gesch. d. Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, 38 ff. and J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* I, 257-9. The position of Glaucias, from whom Basilides received instruction (CLEM. ALEX., *Strom.* VII. 17) and who seemed to have "interpreted" Peter, is obscure. From the standpoint of the church, see the summary of O. BARDENHEWER, *Geschichte d. Altchristl. Literatur* I, Freiburg i. Breisgau 1913, 347 ff.

[3]) Cf. K. L. LEIMBACH, *Realencyklopädie f. Prot. Theol. u. Kirche* XIV, 1904 s.v. Papias.

ἐξηγήσεις [1]) in the first half of the second century when there were still doubts elsewhere as to why Peter himself had not been the acknowledged author of the second gospel (in the traditional ordering of the gospel accounts). Why, in other words, had this account not been εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Πέτρον instead of εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Μάρκον? This question obviously involved—indeed, it depended upon—, first the authority of Mark and secondly, his authority being accounted for, his talents and fitness for this all-important commission. In short, his trustworthiness. This charge of authority must have been brought many times in the early church [2]). It must have been all the more asked about Mark. About Peter, in Rome surely, there would have been no question. But in Asia, particularly where the Gnostic and other heretical sects were making their own versions of Peter's authoritative teachings and where chiliasm was apparently rife, there surely must have been doubts about Mark [3]).

It seems probable, then, that the *Memoirs* of Peter circulated earlier in some areas than the Gospel of Mark, to which PAPIAS, based on John, first bears witness [4]). The modern discovery of a large fragment of *The Gospel according to Peter* in the tomb of a

---

[1]) A possible example of the kind of sources behind such an account, in any case, with which it may be compared, are the *Sayings of Our Lord*, discovered and edited by B. P. GRENFELL-A. S. HUNT, ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ, London 1897,—see esp. 18-9.

[2]) It is fundamental to a proper understanding of Paul, whose authority to speak as he did must have been challenged many times.

[3]) It is possible that Basilides himself "reworked the canonical Gospels" to bring them more in line with Gnostic doctrines (thus J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* I, 128). Cf. E. H. HALL, *Papias and his Contemporaries*, Boston-New York 1899, and J. A. FARRER, *Paganism and Christianity*, New York 1892, 41-150. I have not seen L. V. MOORE, *The Use of Gospel Material in the Pre-Catholic Literature*, Diss., Chicago 1929.

[4]) JUSTIN MARTYR commonly calls the gospels "Memoirs of the Apostles" (cf. *Dial.* 86 for a variation) and he specifically alludes to the Memoirs of Peter at *Dial.* 106: τὸ εἰπεῖν μετωνομακέναι αὐτὸν Πέτρον ἕνα τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ γεγράφθαι ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασιν αὐτοῦ (reference to Peter) γεγενημένον . . . Cf. his special statement to the effect that the memoirs were composed by the apostles and by their disciples (in this case presumably referring to Luke) at *Dial.* 103: . . . . τῶν ἐκείνοις παρακολουθησάντων. The various connotations of expressions based on παρακολουθέω warrant, I think, the meaning here of disciple, or one who has been for long a close associate of someone or is familar with the teachings of someone. Thus the substitution, sometimes, of μαθητής, as in Irenaeus III. i. 1 and ἀκουστής at V. xxxiii. 4 (cf. γνώριμος καὶ φοιτητὴς γεγονώς in EUS., *Demonstratio Evangelica* III. v. 89). See MOULTON-MILLIGAN, *op. cit.* s.v.

monk at Akhmim in Upper Egypt adds to this picture [1]). There were also, probably numerous, apocryphal accounts concerning Peter beginning to circulate [2]), combined with the "endless books of Basilides and the Gnostics" [3]). That Peter's great position, from his very first call till his death in Rome, should have invited such a fate is easy to understand, though admittedly we are still much in the dark about his career. His very character and personality, as we learn of it in the gospel accounts, are striking and tantalizingly interesting. In addition, however, to these factors are, I venture to suggest, certain evidences from II Peter i 12-5 which may add to our understanding of the whole problem [4]). In these verses Peter expresses certain intentions, about which he feels a strong obligation, to recall to the reader's minds what is to be found in the letter at hand and also certain other matters about which we nowadays can only guess. He states, also, that he knows he must soon die "even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed me" [5]). Then Peter states that he will do everything he can to see that after his

---

[1]) U. BOURIANT, "Fragments du texte grec du livre d'Énoch et de quelques écrits attribués à Saint Pierre", *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire* IX. 1, Paris 1892, 93-147. See E. FASCHER, *Pauly-Wissowa* XIX (1938) s.v. and J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* I, 114-5.

[2]) For the κήρυγμα Πέτρου and ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου (EUS. H. E. III. iii. 2) and so forth, see J. QUASTEN, *Patrology* I, 114-6 and C. R. GREGORY, *op. cit.*, 252-4. For the Petrine apocryphal books, see M. R. JAMES, *The Apocryphal N. T.*, Oxford 1924, 505-21.

[3]) So, H. M. GWATKIN, *op. cit.*, 102-4; cf. B. H. STREETER, *Cambridge Ancient History* XI, 253 ff. There may be a reference to all this in II Pet. I. 16 and II. 2. For ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι (cf. *Revelation* II. 2, 6) see T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 229 ff. and 279 ff. See F. C. BURKITT, *Church and Gnosis*, Cambridge 1932.

[4]) I am aware that there are "serious difficulties in the way of accepting" the genuineness of this epistle—thus T. W. LITTLE in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture* (cited above, n. 1 on p. 175) III, 653. They are learnedly belaboured in T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 194 ff. Cf. C. BIGG, "Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude", *Intern. Crit. Comm.*, New York 1905, 199-247.

[5]) The exact meaning intended by ταχινός has been often disputed. The connexions with John XXI, 18-9 are commonly alluded to, though M. R. JAMES, *loc. cit.*, *Cambridge Greek Texts* suggests a reference to the Domine, quo vadis? legend. Inevitably, in the light of the traditions concerning Peter's martyrdom, this text was pointed to his violent death. It is curious, I think, that ταχινός (ταχύς) is here involved with the very end of Peter's life. So far as the connexions with John XIII. 36 be concerned, we cannot, I think, know what Peter himself may have had in mind . . . especially towards the close of his life. But see the learned note of T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 211-4.

death they "will have these things always in remembrance" [1]). Admittedly no such further and more extensive literary work of Peter survives, as such. There is, so far as I know, no other specific reference to it. May it not be hidden, directly and indirectly, in the ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου relationship of Mark? [2]) It would seem clear that Peter never got to the work in question himself; yet, in the light of these verses, is it farfetched to suggest that he did the next best thing? Namely, to commission, or to encourage by allowing, Mark to see that his promise be fulfilled. In fact, is this not the charge in the accounts we have about the origin of Mark's gospel from Clement of Alexandria? Namely, that Mark was persuaded by every kind of exhortation to make a written account of Peter's oral teachings [3]). In one of these accounts it is noted that Peter learned, *by revelation of the spirit*, of Mark's efforts and that he was pleased and that he gave his sanction to it [4]). This account is in essential agreement with the other, quoted also by EUSEBIUS [5]). These accounts do not void the express statement of IRENAEUS that Mark handed down Peter's teachings after the deaths of Peter and Paul in Rome [6]). Could not all these references be to one and

[1]) There is probably a connexion between ἔξοδος in v. 15 and εἴσοδος in v. 11; cf. MOULTON-MILLIGAN, *op. cit.*, s.v. In any case, ἔξοδος must mean Peter's death—so *Acta Joannis*, ed. R. A. LIPSIUS-M. BONNET II. 1, Leipzig 1898, 184; cf. HERMAS, *Vision* III. 4, 3. See C. BIGG, *op. cit.* Since the wording here is τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον and not τὴν ἔξοδον μου the emphasis, presumable points all the more to Peter's own personal responsibility . . . which is certainly borne out in Mark's relation to him.

[2]) T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 201, categorically states that "the Gospel of Mark cannot be the work in question" but he gives no valid reasons militating against the possibility. Cf. C. BIGG, *op. cit.*, 265.

[3]) Ap. Eus., H. E. II. xv. 1-2.

[4]) Γνόντα δὲ τὸ πραχθέν φασι τὸν ἀπόστολον ἀποκαλύψαντος, αὐτῷ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἡσθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἀνδρῶν προθυμίᾳ κυρῶσαί τε τὴν γραφὴν εἰς ἔντευξιν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

[5]) H. E. VI. xiv. 6-7. In this account it is mentioned "that when the matter came to Peter's knowledge he neither strongly forbade it nor urged it forward" — ὅπερ ἐπιγνόντα τὸν Πέτρον προτρεπτικῶς μήτε κωλῦσαι μήτε προτρέψασθαι. In the passage previously quoted, Clement of Alexandria discovers that the knowledge came "by revelation of the spirit"! Clearly, too, the work of Mark at this time cannot be considered as a finished product. It is, in other words, in the process.

[6]) Ap. Eus. H. E. V. viii. 2-3. I know of no evidence that warrants making τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον a reference to anything but their deaths in this particular passage—unless some evidence comes to light that Peter ever left Rome after this time. Presumably παραδέδωκεν refers to the complete work . . . in the sense that Mark's gospel is now passed on to others and made available on its own, so to speak. For παραδίδωμι, see LIDDELL & SCOTT

the same thing, namely, the circumstances surrounding the origin of Mark's gospel? [1])

Now, this very time in question—just before Peter's death in the Neronian persecutions—was one of anxiety and pressing circumstances. Peter, probably along with many others, knew that the time was short, perhaps dreadfully short. In their mood, too, this could have been part of the many predictions concerning the end—rather, as we now know, the beginnings—of the age, about which there must have been myriad confusions and excitingly heroic forebodings [2]). This is the very setting of Mark's gospel origins. Indeed, therefore, "Marcus had to write in haste, and in the midst of danger. For the church was threatened with martyrdom; it had, in fact, only recently experienced the blood purge which resulted in the deaths of Peter and Paul" [3]).

These evidences, it seems to me, fit the actual Marcan gospel as we have it. IRENAEUS was impressed by its rapid movement [4]). It is "a mosaic, carefully constructed out of numerous pieces" [5]).

---

and PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. I take it, then, that Mark's work was not completed till after the deaths of Peter and Paul. For this interpretation of τὴν τούτων ἔξοδον, in addition to T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 398, cf. ARRIANUS, *Epicteti Diss.* ed. H. SCHENKL, IV. 4. 38. For Peter in Rome (it seems to me pointless to belabour the doubts about this), see E. MEYER, *Ursprung u. Anfänge d. Christentums* I, Stuttgart-Berlin 1921, 157 ff. II, 1923, 498 ff. and H. LIETZMANN, *Petrus u. Paulus in Rom*, Berlin 1927; cf. W. LOWRIE, *SS. Peter and Paul in Rome*, London-New York-Toronto 1940. On this whole problem, see M. BESSON, *Saint Pierre et les origines de la primauté romaine*, Geneva 1928. Concerning the traditional allusions to the Roman period, see T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 75-8.

[1]) Suffice it, that it is very probable, from the available evidence that survives, Mark's gospel was started before Peter's death and finished afterwards. Mutual exclusion is out of the question, therefore, when, for example, E. T. THOMPSON, *Gospel acc. to Mark*, Richmond, Virginia 1954, 12 ff. allows it *before*, and H. J. GADBURY in F. J. F. JACKSON-K. LAKE, *The Beginnings of Christianity* II, London 1922, 500 n. 1, allows it *after* the death, of Peter. Cf. JEROME, *De Viris Illustr.* VIII: quod cum Petrus audisset, probavit et ecclesiis legendum sua auctoritate edidit—which is possibly confirmed in *Liber Pontificalis*, ed. L. DUCHESNE, I 50. 118.

[2]) The mood is expressed . . . appropinquante mundi termine.

[3]) F. C. GRANT, *The Earliest Gospel*, New York-Nashville 1944, 56-7. These accounts are not voided by others that discover Mark in Egypt; thus H. E. II. xvi. 1; II. xxiv. 1. Cf. T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 448. The fullest collection of the data relating to Marcan traditions is still, probably, that of Canon Molini, *De Vita et Lipsanis S. Marci Evanglistae*, ed. S. PIERALISI, 1864.

[4]) See SWETE, *op. cit.*, Introd. esp. xxxiii.

[5]) T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 606.

It is "the transcript and ordered arrangement of the traditions current in the church of his day" [1]).

The presumed doubts [2]) to which PAPIAS directed his remarks were, then, not concerned with Mark's order. In the early period of the church, when Mark's gospel was often neglected or even not looked upon with favour, there is no evidence that he was accused of a lack of order. PAPIAS, rather, is directing his remarks—or quoting those of John—in defense and explanation of Mark and his authority and his trustworthiness as a trustee of that authority. Finally, he also feels called upon to declare that, in spite of the conditions militating against Mark's commission—basically the harassments and exigencies of such troubled times—he, in very fact, did his work properly and carefully on a sound foundation [3]). He admits that Mark was not one of the original apostolic circle but behind Mark's gospel was his long association which culminated in his becoming the interpreter of Peter [4]).

But the doubts went deeper, for by the end of the first century, probably, and by the middle of the second century, certainly, there were current other versions of Peter's preachings and teachings. The question was, I take it, which was the most valid and trustworthy. PAPIAS, quoting John, bears unmistakable witness to Mark's capacity to remember accurately the things that Peter

[1]) F. G. GRANT, *op. cit.*, 70. Whether Mark himself was aware of this order seems to me irrelevant and discussions based on such suppositions trifling. In any case, we have no idea whether he was or was not. Cf. V. H. STANTON, *op. cit.* II, 187.

[2]) "Papias is evidently defending Mark against certain charges" (E. H. HALL, *op. cit.*, 12).

[3]) In addition to the factors already mentioned above, it must be pointed out that Mark appears earliest (certainly among the earliest), speading abroad the "Good News" in a strikingly biographical-historical way. It is true that "in spite of difficulties which beset historical questions, it is the historical element that has made Christianity what it is"—T. B. STRONG, "The Bible and Modern Criticism", *Church Problems*, ed. H. H. HENSON, New York-London, 1900, 331. But this "historical element" must have had to prove its worth in these early generations of the church. Could this be one of Peter's supreme contributions? Cf. C. C. MCCOWN, *The Search for the Real Jesus*, New York 1940, 170 ff.

[4]) Even for Paul he was εὔχρηστης εἰς διακονίαν, though Mark's association with Paul has left practically no memorial in the ancient traditions of the church. Occasional later subscriptions in various MSS (e.g. Codex Y, 473—Scrivener 512) to the effect that the Gospel of Mark was dictated by Peter in Rome are, I take it, variations on the ancient theme ἑρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου γενόμενος. Mark was not the only one qualified to remember Peter's preaching (cf. T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 434).

had said and done and to the fact that—unlike, apparently, other claimants—he had not altered them nor had he left out or burked anything [1]).

This express statement of PAPIAS, quoting John, calls for closer scrutiny. We can assume that PAPIAS is not foolish enough to mean that Mark contains everything that Peter preached [2]). There, such a statement means that Mark either omitted nothing of importance or else that Mark omitted nothing even that others felt he should have . . . in the sense that Mark omitted nothing of importance even though it was inconvenient or, as some must have argued and as some still do, even though some things he had said were better left unsaid [3]). This statement of PAPIAS could, therefore, be striking testimony to the fact—which on many other grounds we have come to see—that Mark contained some things that were inconvenient, possibly even troublesome, to the earliest Christians in those generations immediately following the death of Jesus [4]). Testimony, indeed, to the fact that Mark's gospel was criticized—at least in some circles—for being too brief because of omissions and for making, in spite of or because of its brevity, false statements from time to time [5]). This criticism, as we have seen, later became crystallized in the notion, for example, that Mark was but an abbreviation of Matthew. It is also probably behind the epithet, first appearing in the third century, that Mark was known, at least in some circles, as ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος [6]).

---

[1]) H. E. III. xxxix. 15. For παραλείπω, see LIDDELL & SCOTT and PREISIGKE, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.

[2]) But cf. P. PARKER, *op. cit.*, 149 ff.

[3]) Is this our earliest testimony to the Principle of Economy of the doctrine of the *Economia*?

[4]) So much so that more than usually we must see in its survival the fact of it early promulgation (beyond recall) and the great authority of Peter but also it must have had the backing of some powerful church. The so-called neglect of Mark comes after, not before, the middle of the second century; cf. B. H. STREETER, *op. cit.*, 341.

[5]) When PAPIAS, quoting John, avers that Mark made no false statements he allows us the inference that either Mark had been accused of making false statements or else that, unlike others open to such accusations, Mark had not made false statements. It is important, however, to keep in mind that all this is tied directly with the express statement that Mark had not omitted anything.

[6]) HIPPOLYTUS, *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* VII. 30, arguing against Marcion: . . . οὔτε Παῦλος ὁ ἀπόστολος οὔτε Μάρκος ὁ κολοβοδάκτυλος ἀνήγγειλαν. This epithet has been taken to mean everything from the notion that Mark had deliberately torn off his thumb to avoid duties of Jewish

Finally, we can assume, I think, that EUSEBIUS, from all the five books of PAPIAS, did not take this quotation meaninglessly at random. He had, it seems to me, a way of quoting what is richly meaningfull . . . more often than not, his quotations flash light a whole problem with marvelous insight. It seems to me that this quotation from PAPIAS is, in the light of my suggested emendation, no exception. Indeed, it is a brilliantly brief and all-important one. For, after pointedly clearing up Mark's position and authority based on his association with Peter, whose interpreter he was, and after affirming that Mark had written accurately and without falsifying or omitting anything of what he certainly remembered of Peter's teachings (merits not to be found in many other similar writings in the time of PAPIAS [1])), PAPIAS, quoting John, solemnly affirms—and thereby disposes of the charges or doubts that make the affirmation relevant and, indeed, necessary—that, despite Mark's getting to his writing of his gospel account so early and amidst such unfavourable conditions and despite its outstandingly notable briefness (which must have been charged was due to the hurry with which, perforce, it would seem to have been done), Mark, nonetheless, had not done a hasty and therefore careless and ill-thought out job . . . that, indeed, in addition to all its other merits spoken for it by PAPIAS, quoting John, it was in fact οὐ μέντοι τάχει.

---

priesthood—thus E. NESTLE, *ZNTW* IV, 1903, 347—to the notion that some mutilation or malformation of Mark's toes is meant—thus F. H. CHASE in HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible* III, 247. T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 428, allows that it was "commonly known at the beginning of the third century in Rome"! However that may be, Mark XIII. 20, ἐκολόβωσεν is "curtail"; cf. Vulg. in Matt. Marc. "breviare". It is of course possible that this epithet is a sudden appearance of *epic particularity* (so MOULTON-MILLIGAN, *op. cit.*, s.v.—taken to farfetched extremes about Mark's character and career by SWETE, *op. cit.*, xxvii) but it seems to me much more probably a reference to the shortness of the Gospel—thus Augustine's "pedissequus et breviator" (p. 161, n. 1).

[1]) From H. E. III. xxxix. 3. It is curious that PAPIAS says about Matthew's collection of the oracles in the Hebrew language that "each interpreted them as best he could" — Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ· τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ'αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος (H. E. III. xxxix. 16). Cf. T. ZAHN, *op. cit.* II, 509 ff.